



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/584,797	06/01/2000	Guy Nathan	871-82	4971
23117 7590 05/25/2010 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
EXAMINER				
CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2421				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/25/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/584,797

Applicant(s)

NATHAN ET AL.

Examiner

SUMAIYA A. CHOWDHURY

Art Unit

2421

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/24/10 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
 - (a) Applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach the modification of operating parameters.

The Examiner has brought in Siegel (4413260) who teaches an audio reproduction system wherein an operator (serviceman) can offer the manager of the reproduction system a given number of credits, one credit corresponding to the fee necessary to select a song through actuation of the free play credit entry function, enabling the operator to give the special benefit of free use to the manager (col. 2, lines 38-58).

- (b) Applicant argues that the prior art by Miller is nonanalogous art to the application.

The Examiner disagrees. The programmable processor 201 taught by Miller connects to a remote host using a modem, which is a connection over a data network that is capable of distributing any kind of digital information (col. 10, lines 45-55).

(c) Applicant argues Miller does not teach the generation and the transfer of a file of modification commands, which are transferred to the reproduction device, and executed to modify the concerned operating parameters.

Siegel (4413260) teaches an audio reproduction system wherein an operator (serviceman) can offer the manager of the reproduction system a given number of credits, one credit corresponding to the fee necessary to select a song through actuation of the free play credit entry function, enabling the operator to give the special benefit of free use to the manager (col. 2, lines 38-58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 22-24, 25, 27-32, 38-40, 42, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (5959869) in view of McGrane (6496927), Martin, Korn, and Siegel (4413260).

As for claim 22, Miller discloses a system for remote management of at least one audio-visual information reproduction device comprising a central server connected to the telecommunication means of each audio-visual information reproduction device, the central server comprising storage means for storing a database comprising, for each audio-visual information reproduction device, all the management information and all the audio-visual information available, wherein:

the database (storage in remote host computer) comprises all the configurations of operating parameters (price of selections, control parameters, data collection, error diagnosis) of each audio-visual information reproduction device (col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 10, col. 12, lines 6-22),

at least one first screen for displaying information relating to use of the audio-visual information reproduction devices (col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 10, col. 13, lines 10-13);

validation of the choice of each selected audio-visual information reproduction device causes the display of a first series of screens allowing the modification, by the operator (remote host computer), of the operating parameters of at least one audio-visual information reproduction device (The remote host computer is capable of modifying operating parameters of the VMC. col. 12, lines 6-22, col. 13, lines 10-13), and

wherein said modification of the operating parameters is obtained by:

generating a file by the server using information from the database (col. 10, line 45 - col. 11, line 10)

sending, via the server (remote host computer) to the devices concerned, the file when the devices are connected (col. 10, line 45 - col. 11, line 10), and receiving and executing the file by the devices concerned (col. 10, line 45 - col. 11, line 10).

However, Miller fails to disclose:

the "Internet" site is accessible by an operator responsible for managing at least one audio-visual information reproduction device, and comprising a plurality of screens, the central server further comprises an "Internet" site manager communicating with the database;

at least one first screen comprising a drop-down menu displaying a list of the audio-visual information reproduction devices installed locally.

sending the modification commands to the devices concerned, and executing the file of modification commands by the devices;

In an analogous art, McGrane discloses at least one first screen comprising a drop-down menu displaying a list of the audio-visual information reproduction devices installed locally (col. 20, lines 49-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Miller's invention to include the abovementioned limitation, as taught by McGrane, for the advantage of providing a user friendly interface to allow a user to select a device to execute a function.

However, Miller and McGrane fail to disclose:

the "Internet" site is accessible by an operator responsible for managing at least one audio-visual information reproduction device, and comprising a plurality of screens,

the central server further comprises an "Internet" site manager communicating with the database;

sending the modification commands to the devices concerned, and executing the file of modification commands by the devices;

In an analogous art, Martin discloses

the "Internet" site is accessible by an operator responsible for managing at least one audio-visual information reproduction device (col. 3, line 65-col. 4, line 3, col. 5, lines 60-65),

the central server further comprises an "Internet" site manager communicating with the database (col. 3, lines 25-30);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Miller and McGrane's invention to include the abovementioned limitation as taught by Martin, for the advantage of having personnel remotely control and provide instructions to devices located remotely.

However, Miller, McGrane, and Martin fail to disclose wherein the remote site comprises a plurality of screens; and

sending the modification commands to the devices concerned, and executing the file of modification commands by the devices;

In an analogous art, Korn discloses displaying a series of screens to an authorized operator to allow the operator to manually control/manage a plurality of viewing stations (col. 19, lines 47-65, col. 23, lines 10-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Miller, McGrane, and Martin's invention to include the abovementioned limitation, as taught by Korn, for the advantage of allowing the operator to manually control/manage a plurality of viewing stations.

However, Miller, McGrane, Martin, and Korn fail to disclose:

sending the modification commands to the devices concerned, and executing the file of modification commands by the devices;

In an analogous art, Siegel discloses:

An audio reproduction system wherein an operator (serviceman) can offer the manager of the reproduction system a given number of credits, one credit corresponding to the fee necessary to select a song through actuation of the free play credit entry function, enabling the operator to give the special benefit of free use to the manager (col. 2, lines 38-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Miller, McGrane, Martin, and Korn's invention to include the abovementioned limitation, as taught by Siegel, for the advantage of enabling the operator to give the special benefit of free use to the manager.

As for claim 23, Korn discloses displaying a third series of screens displaying management information relating to the use of an audio-visual information reproduction device (col. 20, lines 30-55, col. 22, lines 46-65).

Claim 24 contains the limitations of claim 22 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Claim 24 additionally calls for the following which Martin teaches:

a list of audio-visual information available (Martin; Col. 5, lines 65-Col. 6, lines 21).

Claim 25, as to limitation "characterized in that modification made by the operator in the 1st and /or 2nd screens are stored in a file and are translated into the language of the database to update the data modified in these series of screens and update each audio visual information reproductions as soon as a communication is set up between the host server and each audiovisual information reproduction device" is inherently met by Martin due to the fact that Martin's audiovisual information reproduction devices 13 interface/interact with the host server 11 and its databases via a well known Open Database Connectivity ("ODBC") interface for translating and interfacing with connected database.

Claim 27 limitation "the screens in the 1st and 2nd series of screens comprise a toolbar with a plurality of selection buttons that trigger a display of a screen from the 1st or 2nd series screen, or validate operations performed on the screen being displayed" is further met by Miller, McGrane, Martin in view of Korn, and Siegel's GUI interface (X windows) as discussed in claim 22.

Claim 28, limitation "a 1st selection button in the toolbar initiates the display of the 3rd screen comprising a 1st window displaying information relating to the location of the audiovisual information reproduction device chosen by the operator, and an input area to update the information displayed in the 1st windows if required" is further met by Miller, McGrane, Martin in view of Korn, and Siegel's GUI interface as discussed in claim 22 because of the interactivity of events within the windows graphical interface.

Claim 29, limitation "a second selection button in the toolbar triggers the display of 4th screen in the 2nd series of screens comprising several input areas that will be used to define selection criteria for selecting songs, the list of corresponding songs being initially collected in the database by the site manager sending a request containing the criteria chosen by the operator in the input fields, and secondly displayed in a popup window in the screen" is further met by Miller, McGrane, Martin in view of Korn, and Siegel's GUI interface as discussed in claim 22 because of the interactivity or events within the windows graphical interface.

Claim 30, limitation “validating the choice of a song selected in the window in the 4th screen triggers the display of a 5th screen comprising a plurality of areas containing elements identifying the selected song, a window displaying the list of audiovisual information reproduction devices managed by the operator, a 1st selection area validating the purchase of the selected song for the audiovisual information reproduction devices selected by the operator in the window, by sending a request to the site manager, and a 2nd selection area displaying the 4th screen again” is further met by Miller, McGrane, Martin in view of Korn, and Siegel's GUI interface as discussed in claim 22 because of the interactivity or events within the windows graphical interface.

Claim 31, limitation “a 3rd selection button on the toolbar triggers the display of a 6th screen comprising firstly a number of fields containing information about the use of the audiovisual information reproduction device chosen by the operator, secondly a 1st popup window containing the list of songs to be downloaded to the audiovisual information reproduction device chosen by the operator and a second window containing the list of songs to be deleted from this audiovisual information reproduction device, and thirdly a 1st selection area triggering cancellation of downloading of at least one song previously selected by the operator in the 1st window, and a 2nd selection area triggering cancellation of the deletion of at least

one song previously selected by the operator in the 2nd window” is further met by Miller, McGrane, Martin in view of Korn, and Siegel’s GUI interface as discussed in claim 22 because of the interactivity or events within the windows graphical interface in which Martin’s updating function performs.

Claim 32, as analyzed in claim 22, Martin in view of Korn, Gordon, and Abecassis further meets claimed limitation “a 4th selection button on the toolbar triggers the display of a 7th screen comprising several fields, a 1st window, a 2nd window, the 7th screen also contain selection area that triggers deletion of the song (s) selected by the operator in the 2nd window” due to Martin’s updating function and the interactivity or events within the windows graphical interface (X windows) disclosed by Korn. Korn discloses “information about statistics on the use of the information reproduction device chosen by the operator, list of most frequently played songs, list of least frequently played songs on the audiovisual reproduction device chosen by the operator” as discussed above in claim 22.

Claim 38, “characterized in that the 2nd series of screens includes a screen containing a 1st menu in which the song category required by the operator is selected, a 2nd menu in which the style of the song required by the operator is selected, and a selection area in which the operator validates his choice to trigger the display of a 2nd screen comprising a 1st window displaying the list of songs in the

1st category and style chosen by the operator, and a second windows displaying the list of songs selected by the operator in the list in the 1st window and a selection area in which the operator validates his choice" is further met Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel's GUI interface (X windows) as discussed in claim 22 because of the interactivity or events, i.e., validate the selection within the windows graphical interface.

Claim 39, Korn discloses "characterized in that the list of displayed songs is collected in the database among the most frequently played song on all the operator's jukeboxes as discussed above in claim 22.

Claim 40 "characterized in that the 2nd window also comprises the list of songs already memorized on the audiovisual information reproduction device" is further met by Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel, as discussed in claim 22, due to Korn's updating function and the interactivity or events within the windows graphical interface in which Martin the list of songs already memorized on the audiovisual information reproduction device.

Claim 42, Martin further discloses that the system comprises a magnetic or optical recording system such that the songs selected by the operator are recorded

on a portable magnetic or optical medium, or a solid state electronic memory, preferably semi-conductor based (see Fig. 1, el. 25, 51).

As for claim 44, Siegel discloses wherein the operating parameters of each audio-visual reproduction device correspond to internal functions of each said audio-visual reproduction device (col. 2, lines 38-58).

As for claim 45, Siegel discloses wherein the operating parameters include authorization to use free credits (col. 2, lines 38-58).

5. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel, and further in view of Nichols et al. (US 6138150).

Claim 26, Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel does not disclose that the network site manager comprises means for authenticating the operator designed to limit the operator's access to the audiovisual information reproduction devices that the operator manages.

Nichols (Col. 5, lines 20-27) discloses that the network site manager comprises means of authentication of the operator designed to limit the operator's access to the audiovisual information reproduction devices that the operator manages. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel to limit access to the system, as taught by Nichols so to enhance security and access right for protecting data.

6. Claim 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel and further in view of Kleiman (US 5959945).

Claim 41, "characterized in that the 3rd series of screens comprises at least one screen comprising a window" is further met by Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel as discussed in claim 22, because of the interactivity or events within the windows graphical interface (X windows). As to "indicating the date(s) on which the audiovisual information reproduction device was switched off/ and or on" and "indicating the date(s) on which a communication device and the host server was stopped", they are further met by Korn due to function of the network management protocol that monitor the activities of each node connected to the network. As to "displaying the list of songs played by the audiovisual information reproduction device", they are further met by Korn as discussed above in claim 22

Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel does not clearly disclose displaying the date on which each song was played;

Kleiman discloses information about statistics on the use of the information reproduction device (Col. 9, lines 40-56 and Col. 10, lines 18-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel so the operator could effectively determine music to be downloaded to the corresponding jukebox.

7. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel and further in view of Rhoads (US 6311214).

Claim 33, as analyzed in claims 22 and 27, Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel further meets claimed limitation characterized in that a 5th selection button on the toolbar triggers the display of a screen comprising a 1st series and a 2nd series of input areas that the operator can use to choose.

Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel does not clearly disclose the operator can use to choose for each price the number of possible selections after paying the price in those input areas.

Rhoads discloses the operator can use to choose for each price the number of possible selections after paying the price, in those input areas (Col. 51, lines 22-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel so the operator could have a flexibility to control access of the owned song/music (Col. 51, lines 10-21).

8. Claim 34-37, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel, and further in view of Dobbs et al. (US 5566237).

Claim 34, as discussed in claim 22, limitation "the eighth screen comprises a plurality of input areas used to choose" is met by Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel, as discussed in claim 22, because of the interactivity or events within the windows graphical interface (X windows).

Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel, and Rhoads does not disclose parameters required to adjust audio reproduction means of the audiovisual information reproduction device.

Dobbs discloses parameters required to adjust audio reproduction means of the audiovisual information reproduction device (Abstract and Summary). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel, and with Dobbs by including a sound level adjusting method in order to vary the attenuation of the variable volume circuit from the remote site (Col.9, lines 62-Col.10, lines 16).

Claim 35, limitation "characterized in that a 6th selection button in the tool bar triggers the display of a 9th screen comprising a window displaying all modifications

made by the operator at the time of his connection to the network site managed by the site manager, a 1st selection area triggering validation of all operations displayed in the 1st window and a 2nd selection area canceling all these modification" is further met by Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel as discussed in claim 22, wherein the claimed feature "a 1st selection area triggering validation of all operations displayed in the 1st window and a 2nd selection area canceling all these modification" is inherently/obviously met because for the validation purposes of any editing/modification of data.

Claim 36, "characterized in that a 7th selection button triggers the display of a screen comprising at least one selection area that can be used to activate or deactivate a particular function of the audiovisual information reproduction device", is further met by Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel as discussed in claim 22 because Korn shows various GUIs Box (X windows) that allows user to control the function of the remote host device.

Claim 37, limitation "characterized in that an eighth button in the toolbar triggers the display of a screen that will be used to define a default basic configuration of all or some of the audiovisual information reproduction devices managed by the operator" is further met by Miller, McGrane, Martin, Korn, and Siegel as discussed in claim 22, wherein the claimed feature "a default basic configuration of all or some of the audiovisual information reproduction devices

managed" is inherently met because each audiovisual information reproduction device has its own default configuration that is set by either the manufacture or by network administrator during the configuration of each audiovisual information reproduction device that connects to the network.

Claim 43, Martin further discloses songs are recorded on a portable magnetic or optical medium in a compressed format, the songs only being decompressed and when the song is played on an audiovisual information reproduction device.

Miller, McGrane, Martin, Korn, Siegel, and Dobbs does not disclose recorded song are encrypted and decrypted when the song is played back.

Rhoads discloses that songs are encrypted and recorded on a portable magnetic or optical medium in a compressed format, the songs only being decompressed and decrypted when the song is played on an audiovisual information reproduction device (Col. 44, lines 17-col.45, lines 22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Miller, McGrane, Martin and Korn, and Siegel, and Dobbs with Rhoads so to prevent unauthorized copy and use of the recorded media.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUMAIYA A. CHOWDHURY whose telephone number is (571)272-8567. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

/Sumaiya A Chowdhury/
Examiner, Art Unit 2421